

THE HONORABLE RONALD B. LEIGHTON

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

SEAN WILSON, individually and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

PTT, LLC, a Delaware limited liability
company, d/b/a HIGH 5 GAMES, LLC,
a Delaware limited liability company,

Defendant.

Case No. 18-cv-05275-RBL

**DECLARATION OF TODD
LOGAN**

1 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, I declare and state as follows:

2 1. I am an attorney at Edelson PC, which has been retained to represent Plaintiff
3 Sean Wilson in this matter. I am entering this declaration in opposition to Defendant's Motion
4 for Protective Order Re: Plaintiff's Subpoenas to Apple Inc. and Google LLC (the "Motion").

5 2. I have personal knowledge of the matters stated herein and, if called upon, I could
6 and would competently testify thereto.

7 3. Before February 14, 2020, I will communicate to Apple and Google, through their
8 counsel, that: (i) Plaintiff does not seek Purchase Information for transactions occurring prior to
9 April 7, 2014, and (ii) Plaintiff does not seek the names or contact information of putative class
10 members. I will likewise ensure that—in the event Plaintiff pursues an enforcement action
11 against Apple and/or Google—the court assigned to that enforcement action is made aware of
12 Plaintiff's concessions.

13 4. Plaintiff has been pursuing High 5 transaction history information through
14 traditional party-discovery Requests for Production since January 2019.

15 5. On December 10, 2019, High 5 produced a dataset of transaction history
16 information (the "First Dataset").

17 6. That day, I requested by email that High 5 identify "which transactions are
18 included in this file? (*e.g.*, are these transactions associated with Washington IP addresses? Is it
19 all Washington transactions during the included time period?)."

20 7. On December 11, 2019, Defendant's counsel responded by email that the First
21 Dataset reflected "purchase history from IP addresses associated with Washington," but that
22 transactions from a several-month-long time period might be missing from the First Dataset.

23 8. After a telephonic meet and confer in which I identified other concerns regarding
24 the First Dataset, Defendant's counsel stated by email on December 12, 2019, that the First
25 Dataset reflected "more than just purchases from Washington IP addresses."
26
27
28

